



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DOSITHEUS, THE SAMARITAN HERESIARCH, AND HIS
RELATIONS TO JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN
DOCTRINES AND SECTS¹

(A STUDY OF PROFESSOR SCHECHTER'S RECENT
PUBLICATION)

DR. K. KOHLER
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.

Since the discovery of the Hebrew Ben Sira by Professor Schechter in 1897, then Lector of Talmud at Cambridge, England, the Cairo Genizah treasures have yielded a number of documents which cast new light upon entire periods of Jewish history. The first part of the "Documents of Jewish Sectaries" just published by the Cambridge Press, edited, translated, and accompanied with copious notes and an Introduction by Professor Schechter under the special title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, will in all likelihood, as was stated by Professor Margoliouth in the *London Athenaeum* of November 26, "outrank his other publications in general importance and interest." Not because, as the latter thinks, it has anything to do with the early Judaic phase of Christianity. There is absolutely nothing in the document to support this conjecture except the fact that the Messiah is represented as "the teacher of righteousness" and that his followers are spoken of as "those who entered the new covenant" at Damascus. There is no reference whatsoever to either baptism or any other Christian practice or doctrine. On the contrary, the whole sacrificial system with all the Levitical laws of purity connected therewith, the most rigid observance of the Sabbath and the dietary laws are insisted upon throughout the messianic manifesto so as to offer no ground whatsoever to ascribe it either to followers of the Nazarene teacher who with such scathing language condemned all this ritualism, or of John the Baptist who wanted the cleansing of man from sin by the water of repentance, not by blood. Still more far-fetched is

¹ This article had been finished several weeks before the letter of E. N. Adler in the *London Athenaeum* of February 4 came to the notice of the writer, affording him great satisfaction to find a number of points brought out that accord with the results of his own study, particularly the allusion of the document to Simeon ben Shetah and to Pompey.

the idea of identifying "the man of scoffing," "filled with the spirit of Belial," with St. Paul, as the foe of the sect in question is charged with having seduced the people to crimes such as polygamy and other crimes of a sacrilegious and socio-political nature that can have no reference to the austere and world-despising apostle of the heathen.

In one respect, however, Professor Margoliouth's criticism is correct. Professor Schechter's interpretation and conception of the document failed to take account of "the personal note" that runs through it and finds its expression in "the frequent use of the well-known Hebrew form of 'Hearken ye unto me!' which seems to prove that the document was composed at the time of the religious events it treats of." On reading it we cannot help being impressed by the powerful appeal with which the leader, or rather leaders, of the movement address themselves to the adherents of the sect, while denouncing in vehement language their mighty adversaries who obviously are under the leadership of a politically strong and influential personality. In the form of a ringing, fierce protest, which tells of the presence of the dreaded powerful personality, they lay down the principles of belief and practice they are bound to maintain by the oath of their "new covenant" in opposition to those of their antagonists.

The learned editor correctly assumes that the work of which the Genizah harbored the fragments of two recensions, one of small extent assigned by him to the tenth, the other of more extensive length pointing to the twelfth century, and which must have been much in circulation at the time in circles sympathizing with the views therein expressed, was identical with the one the early Karaites speak of as Zadokite in character and origin and as known to Anan, the founder of Karaism, who made good use thereof. Nor is it merely accidental that a mutilated fragment of Anan's main work, *Sefer ha Mizwoth*, which forms the contents of Professor Schechter's Second Document, was found in the Genizah alongside of the other. Unfortunately, however, Professor Schechter allowed himself to be misled by Kirkisani and other writers of the tenth century² to make of Zadok, after the old unhistorical method, a heresiarch and—in opposition to Geiger's well-known theory accepted by Wellhausen, Schürer, and other eminent historians—construe a history of the Zadokites, the Dositheans, and the Falashas full of glaring contradictions and based upon opinions held by Beer, Frankel, and Wreschner which do not bear closer scrutiny, as will be seen in the course of this article. This attitude appears all the more strange as in his *Intro-*

² See Harkavy's article in Graetz, *Gesch. d. J.*, V³, 413 ff.

duction to Ben Sira (p. 35) Professor Schechter called attention to the fact that the mention of the priestly house of Zadok in the prayer fully corroborated Geiger's theory as to the character of the Sadducees in the pre-Pharisaic period to which Ben Sira belongs.

Indeed, eight years ago Professor Schechter was far nearer the truth, when, in a conversation with the writer, he spoke of the Dosithean character and origin of the manuscript he had brought from Cambridge. The very opening words of the document show it to have been the messianic pronunciamiento of the Samaritan heresiarch, as, in direct opposition to the messiahship of David, the king of Judah, it announces "the sprouting forth of a Messiah from Israel and Aaron," elsewhere "from Aaron and Israel" (see pp. 1, 12, 19); that is, from the Samaritan line of the priestly house of *Zadok*—a phrase strangely misunderstood by the editor (*Introduction*, xiii, note 6). No less clearly is the Samaritan character of the messianic pronunciamiento brought out at the very outset when it speaks of "the End of the Wrath" having arrived at the close of the 490 years (so correctly emended by the editor with reference to the 70 weeks of years in Dan. 9:2, 24) after Nebuchadnezzar's overthrow of the nation (586 B.C.). For not only do the Samaritans divide their history into an era of divine favor and one of divine wrath,³ but they alone could look upon the second temple period as a continuation of the era of wrath. Only when in the year 63 B.C. Samaria was for a short while liberated from the dominion of Judea by Pompey, could an era of divine favor have been looked for, one to be brought about by a Messiah from their own midst. And exactly as John Hyrcanus had been declared the priest-king of a higher order predicted in Scripture,⁴ so could the messianic claim be raised by a priest of the more legitimate house of Zadok. Of course, we must not expect messianic calculations to be based upon exact chronology. Suffice it to know that we are brought down to the former half of the first pre-Christian century which witnessed the rise of the Pharisean party to power under the leadership of Simeon ben Shetah, the brother of Queen Alexandria Salome, "the man of hot hands," the unrelenting, uncompromising foe of the Sadducees,⁵ and, no doubt, dreaded and cursed by the opposing party as no other leader. And, while we have no date even approximately to place Dositheus, the founder of the new Samaritan sect, we have every reason to believe that his being known as the first heresiarch, who

³ See Abul-Fath—37; Heidenheim's *Sam. Bibl.*, *passim*, and *J.Q.R.*, VIII, 572.

⁴ Ps. 110; Targ. Jer. Deut. 33:10, and in the Testament of Levi.

⁵ Jer. Sanh., vi, 4, p. 23b.

had some relationship to the mythical founder of Sadduceeism, indicates that it is just this turbulent period in Jewish history in which he appeared on the scene as the antagonist of the Pharisees and their powerful leader.

Before analyzing our document, let us consider the meaning of the epithet used to designate the party assailed in the book: *bone hayiz* (pp. 4 and 8). The word cannot mean "builders of a fence," as translated and explained with reference to Aboth I, 1: *ššū ššyag la Torah*, "Build a fence around the Law," as our document also insists upon having a fence around the Sabbath (p. 10). Compare our further remarks on the passage. Taken from Ezek. 13:10, the word signifies "builders of a hollow partition wall," and is an apt nickname for the Pharisees whose separatism is declared to be pretentious and hollow.⁶ Against these separatists and their leader, Simeon ben Shetah, called "the scoffer who pours forth water of deceitfulness," who "filled with the spirit of Belial drags the people by his teaching into the threefold snare of fornication, of greed, and of desecration of the sanctuary," is directed the fierce arraignment (pp. 4, 8, and 20). Particularly is the latter charged with having fomented discord and strife and caused the people to transgress the laws concerning sexual purity, the Sabbath and festivals, and those of righteousness. Nay more. He made them enter an alliance with the pagan rulers "concerning whom God said: 'Their wine is the poison of dragons and the head of asps that is cruel.'"⁷ This head, says the document, refers to the "head of the kings of Javan who came to execute vengeance upon them." A glance at the history of the time and at the Psalms of Solomon⁸ leaves no room for doubt that this refers to the dearly-bought Roman friendship which ended in the submission of Judea to the rule of Pompey, who could well be called the "head of all the kings of the Macedonian empire."

Here we have then the historical background for the messianic movement also among the Samaritans, who saw one pretender after the other rise, especially after Herod had brought Samaria again under Judean dominion.⁹ We can also understand that, since Damascus formed the headquarters of Pompey during his invasion of Judea, the Samaritans who fled from their capital should have found a safe refuge in the vicinity of the northern city.

⁶ Cf. Ephes. 2:14.

⁷ Deut. 32:33.

⁸ 2; 8; 17; see Ryle and James' *Introduction*, xl ff.

⁹ See Josephus, *Ant.*, XVIII, iv, 1; Schürer, *G.V.I.*, I, 358; II, 151.

THE SAMARITAN MESSIAH

The Samaritan literature as well as the Samaritan creed has scarcely received the attention it deserves at the hands of Jewish scholars, owing to the national prejudice voiced in many parts of the Talmud against them, just as the Karaites labored under the same difficulty. Both sects, like all heresies, simply represent an arrested growth; and it can easily be shown that the Samaritans retained Haggadic and apocalyptic views as well as Halakic doctrines which were afterward rejected by the Pharisees, or rabbis, in the course of their historical progress. Their oldest literature, their liturgy, and their folklore are saturated with the same ideas and views as are the Pseudepigrapha and the later rabbinical Midrash or Targum literature. Their apotheosis of Moses had its parallel among the Essenes and is simply pre-Talmudic and Hellenistic. Concerning the messianic hope we only know that they saw in Deut. 18:15 the prediction of a Moses-like prophet to come and be the teacher and law-giver of the people. So we are told by Origen with reference to John 6:14-15.¹⁰ He is their Taëb, "the one who comes back."¹¹ But he is also called "the Star" (*op. cit.*, 35) with reference to the prophecies in Num. 24:11-18, the messianic character of which is emphasized both by Josephus¹² and Philo.¹³

The appearance, however, or rather the recognition of the Messiah when he appeared, depended in those times chiefly upon a chronological calculation.¹⁴ This is the reason why the chronological and calendar system with its Jubilees plays so great a rôle in eschatology, and it was held to be a "secret lore."¹⁵ Following the Persian system of belief, the apocalyptic writers placed the messianic era at the end, or the middle of the sixth millennium so as to have the *seventh* as the world-Sabbath.¹⁶ As a prominent feature of the approaching advent of the Messiah is mentioned also the increasing power of the spirit of the Evil One, called

¹⁰ Cf. *Contra Celsum*, I, 57; Philo de Monarchia, 9; Gfroerer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, I, 2, 324-42; Josephus, *Ant.*, XX, v, 1; viii, 6.

¹¹ Merx, *Der Messias or Taëb der Samaritaner*, 42.

¹² *Ant.*, IV, vi, 4-6.

¹³ *Vita Mosis*, I, 52-53.

¹⁴ Cf. Sanhedrin 92b; 97b; Abod. Zara 9ab; Luke 17:20: *Μετὰ παραρρήσεις*; Heidenheim, *Bibl. Samarit.*, III, Introd., xxix.

¹⁵ Ketub. 112a; W. B. Levy, s.v. "Sod"; cf. Ezek. 13:9; Samarit. Chronicle at the close.

¹⁶ R. Hash. 31a; Tamid 6:4; Assumptio Mosis 10:12; Testam. Levi, chap. 17; Slavonic Enoch, chaps. 32, 33; cf. Roensch, *B. d. Jubileen*, 385; Merx, *op. cit.*, 23; Bousset, *Relig. d. Judenth.*, II, 282 f.

Belial, Satan, or Angramainyus (Armillus) whom the Messiah is to "slay with the breath of his lips."¹⁷ The great world-drama ends with the final triumph of the Messiah over Belial and his Satanic hosts.¹⁸

THE MESSIAH OF THE DOSITHEAN SECT

We are now prepared to listen to the claims put forth in our document for its "Messiah from the house of Aaron and Israel," and to see whether we are justified in identifying him with the Samaritan heresiarch. As stated above, we have before us a messianic pronunciamiento in the form of a personal appeal but incomplete, owing partly to the defective state in which it was found, partly also to unskilful copyists who, either through carelessness or because they desired to make only an excerpt of the whole work, omitted a great deal and disarranged it so as to put it into disorder. The beginning, however, and also the end of the work seem to have been preserved. Regarding the latter, the editor failed to see that pp. 19 and 20, though containing matter presented in the former part, form the conclusion of the work and do not belong before p. 9, as the translation (pp. xxxix-xliv) has it. The appeal begins:

Hearken unto me, all ye who know righteousness, and meditate on the doings of God. For He will have strife with all flesh and execute judgment upon all who despise Him. Because of their faithlessness with which they forsook Him He hid His face from Israel and His sanctuary, and delivered them to the sword. But remembering the covenant with the former generations He left a remnant to Israel, and did not exterminate them. And now at the end of the wrath, 490 years after He had delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, He remembered them and caused the root of His planting to sprout forth from Israel and Aaron to take possession of His land and to rejoice in the good of His soil. And they meditated over their sin and knew that they were guilty men, and for twenty years they were like blind groping in the way. Then God considered their deeds, for they sought Him with a perfect heart, and He raised for them a teacher of righteousness to make them walk in the way of His heart. And He had made known to former generations [read *ha rishonim*] what He shall do [read *Yaaseh*] "in the last generation" (Deut. 29:21) to an assembly of treacherous men who turn away from the path. Indeed, this is the time concerning which it has been written: "As a backsliding heifer, so did Israel slide back" (Hos. 4:16), since has risen the Man of scoffing who has poured forth unto Israel waters of deceitfulness, and caused them to wander about in the pathless wilderness, to bring low the heights from of old, and to turn away from the paths of righteousness, and to

¹⁷ Isa. 11:4; Targum, cf. Bousset, *op. cit.*, 588 f.; III Sibyl, 63; see "Belial" and "Eschatology," *J.E.*, II, 659; IV, 212.

¹⁸ Cf. Luke 10:17; Didache 16:3.

remove the boundaries which former generations set to their inheritance so as to make cleave to them the curses of His covenant (Deut. 29:20) and deliver them to the sword that is to execute the vengeance of the covenant (Lev. 26:25).

It is to Pompey's invasion into Judea which brought defeat upon the Pharisees that these strong words allude. But the appeal continues (p. 2), addressing "those who entered the covenant" in truly apocalyptic style, pointing to the great cosmic battle fought between the powers of evil "which ever ensnared men since the days of the oldest generations [read *doroth Kedem*], that is Cain and his line of descendants, and the Watchers before the Flood" and those "who are written down in God's book as His friends and the men of His covenant to whom the years of the End and the secrets of the Sabbath and the seasons were revealed." It is the same point of view which is taken by the Books of Enoch, the Jubilees, the Book of Adam in its pre-Christian form, and similar works that find expression in the rather obscure text which requires emendation now and then in order to be intelligible. Just as Moses found in Jannes and Jambres—see the art. in *J.E.*—the workers of magic, plotters of mischief, so does the "teacher of righteousness" encounter the evil powers of Belial in the dreaded Pharisean leader. This is the leading thought pervading the introductory part. The concluding part likewise is apocalyptic in its nature. It dwells on the great day of Judgment when God will, as is described by the last of the prophets (Mal. 3:16 ff.), "let His glory shine upon the righteous who remained steadfast to the Law and the covenant which they renewed at Damascus" and "are written in His book of remembrance as fearing Him and thinking upon His name," but deliver the wicked and those that have broken the covenant which they have entered anew to destruction through the hand of Belial, and pour out his wrath upon the princes of Judah. All those who have been faithless to the new covenant and have no share in the house of the Teacher (read *Beth ha Moreh*, p. 20, l. 13), whose names are not counted in the council of the people and not inscribed in the book, will not come safely out of the fiery ordeal.

In accordance with this apocalyptic system which Samaritan writers of the fourth and the twelfth centuries, in common with the authors of the Books of Enoch and the Jubilees and all the Essene writers, believed to have come down from the patriarchs as tradition from Noah, Shem, and Adam, our Manifesto endeavors to establish the messianic claims of its Moses-like teacher upon Scriptural texts in contrast to those held forth by believers in a Messiah from the house of David. Not David,

who in having many wives did not observe the law (Deut. 17:17) nor even read it, as it remained hidden away in the ark from the time of Joshua until a (son of) Zadok rose (II Kings 20:22), and, as it was disclosed, there were also disclosed (read *we nigalu*) the evil deeds of David (p. 5, ll. 2-5). No. In Zadok God built up for the sin-laden

a faithful house in Israel the like of which never arose before and hitherto, they who hold fast to Him for the life of eternity and all glory of man is theirs, as God confirmed it to them through the prophet Ezekiel when He said (44:15): "The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok that kept the guardianship of My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from Me they shall offer Me fat and blood." The priests are those of Israel who have returned of those who departed from the land of Judah; the Levites are those who "joined" them, and the sons of Zadok are the chosen ones of Israel called by name who rise up at the end of days. Behold, their names are distinctly given after their genealogy together with the end of their rising up and the number of their sufferings and the years of their wanderings and an exposition of their doings until to the end [read *ad kēz ha shanim*] when they will have no longer any share in the house of Judah (pp. 3-4).

Omitting the rest, which is given in defective form, we learn from these lines that the sect laid great stress upon a genealogy of the house of Zadok, and that their followers kept a book containing their traditions as to the messianic hope and their chronological system, exactly like the one frequently referred to in the various Samaritan chronicles in our possession. This book our Manifesto mentions in its concluding part (p. 19, last line) with reference to Ezek. 13:9—a verse connected also by rabbinical tradition with the *secret lore* of the calendar and the *ordination* of the teachers of the Law.¹⁹ It is the following verse, by the way, which suggested to the writers of the Manifesto the name "Builders of the hollow partition wall" for their Pharisean antagonists given them in the lines that follow. That the priestly families kept genealogical lists tracing their pedigree back to the remotest time is a fact attested to by Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, I, 7).

In contradistinction to "the law-giver from Judah" (Gen. 49:10) which forms the basis for the Pharisaic claim, our Manifesto points to Num. 21:18, where "the law-giver" is mentioned in connection with the well which the princes of Israel have digged, the passage also being referred to "the Interpreter of the Law and those of Israel who, having returned, departed from Judah and settled in the land of Damascus, remaining true to his teachings, waiting until he, the teacher of righteous-

¹⁹ Ket. 112a; Yer. R. H. II, 58b; Sanh. I, 18c.

ness, will again appear at the end of the days" (p. 6). Many prophetic passages containing a rebuke or condemnation of the people of Judah and of Israel, such as Isa. 7:15; 8:15, and particularly Hosea, are profusely quoted, or utilized, in the Manifesto. But one passage in Amos 5:26-27, in which "God saith: I will lead you as exiles beyond Damascus," furnished an especially opportune text on which to base the doctrines of the sect: "Ye shall carry the protection of your King"—this is the Torah—"Your King"—this is the people (cf. Prov. 8:15); "the pointing out of their idol-worship"—this refers to the books of the prophets whose words ancient Israel had held in contempt; and "the Star"—this is the Interpreter of the Law who has come to Damascus, the one of whom Scripture (Num. 24:17) says: "A star will come forth from Jacob and a scepter from Israel"—that is the prince of the whole congregation who, when he appears again, "shall smite all the sons of Sheth." We have here the exact traditional messianic interpretation of the verse adopted by the Samaritans.²⁰ In all probability the original Manifesto contained more explicit allusions to the personality of the "Star," the "Messiah," and "Teacher," whose line of ancestry went back to Zadok, the high priest, and to Aaron. All that we now learn is that he was also given the name "Yaḥid," "the only one," or "the only one teacher" (p. 20, ll. 1, 14, 32), that he died in the vicinity of Damascus, and that his followers waited for his return (7, 20; 12, 24; 19-20). Whether the peculiar name *ha Yaḥid* was given him in view of his martyrdom with reference to Zechariah 12:10, "the mourning for the only one," is difficult to say.

Now as to the use and recognition of the prophetic books by a Samaritan sect, we will have to modify the accepted view of this. The writers of our Manifesto regarded them, in common with the ancient rabbis, as "words of tradition"²¹ alongside of the Torah exactly as they did all non-canonical books. It is the doctrinal side that gives us a true insight into the messianic movement. As a restorer of the law, "the teacher of righteousness," no doubt with a view to the name *Zadokite* which was interpreted "follower of righteousness,"²² the Messiah of our Document, shows all the unyielding rigor which characterized only one heresiarch known to Jewish and Samaritan history, namely Dositheus. However much the various Patristic and Samaritan writers may differ in regard to the chronological date and other matters per-

²⁰ See Merx, *op. cit.*

²¹ Dibre Kabbalah; see W. B. Levy, s.v. "Kabbalah."

²² See Josephus, *Ant.*, XII, x, 5-6; Epiphanius *Haeres.*, i. 14.

taining to the life of this "first of the heresiarch," as he is called, they agree as to his teachings relative to the Sabbath, the purity, the dietary and marriage laws having been extremely rigorous and inimical to all contact with the heathen world; so that there can scarcely be room for doubt that we have his teachings before us. The name *Ilfan*, which, as Shaharastani tells us,²³ Dositheus bore, besides that of "the Star" and the Prophet predicted by Moses (Deut. 23:15), is the Aramaic word for "teacher." Shaharastani places him at about the century preceding Christ. This is confirmed by Origen (*op. cit.*) who also tells us that his adherents who preserved his books believed that he "did not taste death but continued to live in some form." According to Epiphanius (*Haeres.* i. 13) he was a learned Jew who from disappointment went over to the Samaritans, and that at the end of his career he retired into a cave where he died of voluntary starvation. The best information about the Dosithean doctrines have been preserved by the Samaritan historian Abul-Fath, in which, while making allowance for inaccuracies due to hearsay reports, we cannot fail to recognize as in the main identical with the laws contained in our Document.²⁴ More will

²³ P. 258, Haarbr. transl.

²⁴ See Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, 253 ff.; Kirchheim, *Karme Shomron*, 25 f.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenih.*, I, 65 f.; Herzfeld, *G.V.I.*, II, 600, and Schechter's *Introduction*. We are told that the "Dositheans had a different mode of reckoning the period of purification." In regard to this difference between the Samaritans and the Pharisees see Nidda, 66a, 33a, and later on: "they declared the fountain into which dead vermin had fallen to be impure." This also is found to be Samaritan; see Mas. Kuthim (ed. Kirchheim), I, 33, n. 6; that "he upon whom the shadow of a grave has fallen is unclean for seven days." This should read: "he who had come beneath the shadow, that is, beneath the roof of the projecting enclosure of a grave, is unclean in accordance with Num. 19:14; see Sifre, *ad loc.*: they "forbade the eating of eggs of fowl as unfit for sacrifice." This is, as Schechter has shown, similar to a statute given in our Document: "they rejected the formula: 'Blessed be our God forever!'" This probably refers to the Pharisaic formula: "Blessed be our God from one world to the other," which was to accentuate the belief in resurrection, which the Samaritans denied (see Jost, *G. d. J.*, I, 65 f., and Berak. 9:4): "they did not pronounce the Tetragram but used Elohim instead." This also is Samaritan; see farther on: "they counted Pentecost from the day after Passover, as do the Jews." This is scarcely a correct statement. See farther on: "They taught that a priest might enter an infected house, as long as he did not speak forth." It is also rabbinic Halaka that the house becomes unclean only by the priest's express declaration (Neg'aim 12:5): "That the question whether the tenement adjoining the impure house is also unclean should be decided by watching whether a clean or unclean bird first alights upon the former." For this strange statement see Kirchheim, *op. cit.*, 26. "On Sabbath they ate and drank only from earthen vessels, not from those of metal." The reason for this statute is that the latter might be, when unclean, purified on Sabbath, which is

be said later anent his changing the festivals by introducing the solar calendar with 30 days a month.

Reminiscences of the name *Yahdu*, to which Schechter refers,²⁵ and of his writings have been preserved in later legends which represent Dositheus as having been compelled to flee for some offense and as having carried his books with him to Suweika near Jerusalem, which seems to be a confusion with the town Kokaba near Damascus. Sources hostile to the Dositheans represent him as "a descendant of the mixed multitude that went with Israel out of Egypt,"²⁶ or as a son of Palti (Palpul—Balaam?), the chief magician in Pharaoh's time who plotted harm against Moses.²⁷ Kokaba as the seat of the Dosithean sect is mentioned in the Midrash in connection with a dispute R. Meir had with a Dosithean of Kokaba.²⁸ The name Dositheus corresponding to Nathaniel or Mattan-yah is frequent in pre-Christian times. Possibly the name of the village Kokaba has some connection with the settlement there of Dositheus, "the Star" (*Kokab*), and it is scarcely a mere incident that the mythical founder of the Ebionite sect was also supposed to have lived there.²⁹ Julius Africanus³⁰ speaks of Kokaba near Damascus as one of the Jewish villages whither the relatives of Jesus had fled. The majority of writers maintain that the Dositheans denied resurrection, just as did the Sadducees, the mythical founder of whose sect, Zadok, is brought into historical connection with Dositheus.³¹ The belief in his reappearance has, in fact, nothing to do with the belief in resurrection; it must be regarded rather as the characteristic feature of the Messiah who is supposed to disappear and to reappear,³² which is also a Samaritan doctrine.³³

forbidden, whereas clay vessels cannot be purified. "They insisted on providing food and water for the cattle on the day before the Sabbath, forbidding to do so on the Sabbath day." This also is Samaritan law. "In the code of their prophet it was stated that God was worshiped in the land of *Havilah* (the text has *Sueilah*) until Mount Gerizim took its place." This seems to be intended to contradict the statement of the Book of Jubilees (4: 25-26) and the Book of Adam that the Mount of the east side of Eden (*har ha Kedem*) as the place of worship for the Protoplastes was afterward substituted by Mount Zion. A book containing the history of the leaders of men (Imams) since Adam is ascribed to him by Abul-Fath as well as by Eulogius. This is probably the Zadokite genealogy.

²⁵ *Introd.*, xxiv, n. 52.

²⁶ *Chronique Samaritaine*, ed. Neubauer, 58.

²⁷ Cf. Heidenheim, *Vierteljahrschr.*, IV, 369.

²⁸ See art. "Dosethai" in *J.E.*, IV, 643.

²⁹ See Ewald, *G.V.I.*, VII, 221, n. 3, and cf. Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.*, 137, 428, 433.

³⁰ See Eusebius, *Church History*, I, 7, 14.

³² See Pesik. 49; Pesik. Rab. xv.

³¹ See Montgomery, 255-59.

³³ See Cowley in *J.Q.R.*, VIII, 572.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SECT

On investigating the constitution mapped out in our Document, we cannot be in doubt that we have before us the social conditions of the first pre-Christian century as they then prevailed in Judea. The community was composed of four classes, viz., priests, Levites, common Israelites, and proselytes. The last ones, to whom the Psalms (115:13; 118:4) and the Liturgy (the Eighteen Benedictions) accorded a special rank in the pre-Christian time, were not represented in the administrative body of Ten, which consisted of 4 priests and Levites and 6 common Israelites selected as Judges of the community (*e-dah*). They were to be familiar with the "Book of Public Reading" (*Sefer-ha-Hagoh*), that is the Torah scroll written in the ancient Samaritan letters, the loud reading of which, especially with regard to the ineffable Name, required an expert,³⁴ "and also with the fundamental principles of the Covenant" (that is the Interpretation of the Law adopted by the sect at Damascus as forming "the New Covenant"). They had to be between the ages of 25 and 60 years, not older, as, says the Document with reference to Jubilees 23:11, pointed out by the editor, "Owing to God's wrath against the generations after the flood the human intellect fails in old age."³⁵ These judges had the power to inflict capital punishment, or banishment, on the members of the sect, but only in conjunction with the two heads of the community (p. 10).

The community being divided into smaller settlements, camps, or towns, two men were to be placed at the head of each containing a congregation of ten members of the sect (cf. Sanh. 2a), the one a priest who likewise had to be familiar with the "Book of Public Reading," the acknowledged authentic Torah scroll, and of the age between 25 and 60. In case no priest possessing the required knowledge was found, a Levite was to take his place.³⁶ His function was to keep the genealogical records of the members of the settlement and to pronounce the final decision of the Law, especially also to declare the uncleanness of the person or house infected with leprosy (Lev., chap. 13). The other one called *Mebakker*,

³⁴ As to the meaning of *Hagah* see Sanhed. 10:1 and W. B. Levy, s.v. Ordinary Samaritan Pentateuch scrolls often had *Shema*, שְׁמָע ("the name") written in place of the Tetragram (see Heidenheim, *Bibliot. Samarit.*, III, 182). According to Tosifta Sanhedrin 4:7, the king's Torah scroll was not to be used by anyone else but was subject to revision by the three judicial courts, that of the priests, the Levites, and the common Israelites.

³⁵ Cf., however, the rabbinical interpretation of Gen. 24:1 in B. Mez., 87a.

³⁶ P. 13. Cf. Yoma, 26a, and art. "Levi" in *J.E.*

"inspector" (that is "examiner" or "overseer," not "censor," as Professor Schechter translates it),³⁷ held the more important office of instructor and supervisor. He had to be consulted even by his colleague, the priest, in all matters pertaining to Levitical purity;³⁸ he had to examine the status of each member as to his fitness and proper position, and had to administer oaths; he had the power to impose penalties for offenses, or to condone them and readmit the penitents; also, in conjunction with the general Board of Administrators, to assess the members as to their dues for the support of the poor or the priests. Exactly like the *Episcopos* ("overseer") of the Essene, afterward the Christian "Congregation of God" (Didascalia, II, 20, 24), he is "to show compassion for all as a father for his children and tend to their needs as the shepherd of his flock rescuing from the hand of the insolent the oppressed and the crushed." "Without the inspector's permission no member of the camp is allowed to bring anyone into the congregation, nor shall anyone have commercial dealings with the [sons of the] merchants [read *b'ne ha Sohërim* or *Ba'alê ha Sehorah*], if this be by a pledge from hand to hand, nor shall he establish a partnership [read *heber*; cf. Job 40:30] for mercantile purposes, unless he inform the inspector of the camp that he may establish the mercantile league [read *heber ha miknah*]." The entire paragraph, the meaning of which escaped the translator, receives its light from the statutes, concerning the oath to be administered by the inspector, preserved only in fragmentary form (pp. 13-15).

At the head of the entire community was to be placed a higher duumvirate consisting of a priest equipped with greater knowledge and ability as well as authority to bind all together, and a chief inspector "familiar with every form of secret discourse of men and every language, symbolic or plain." He has the final decision in every dispute, and he superintends, in conjunction with the Board of Judges, the charity, "receiving from the well-to-do a share of their monthly earnings and distributing the same among the poor, the aged, the homeless, and those who are without protection" (p. 14).

Presumably the ten judges and the two chief magistrates resided in what is called "the City of the Sanctuary," a place set apart as most

³⁷ *Bakker* occurs in the Bible only as a verb signifying "to examine," particularly for the shepherd, and also for the priest or sage. Accordingly *Mebakker* is the examiner or overseer—*Episcopos* in the sense of the rabbinical *Parnas* from *πρωτοῦς*, "caretaker." In earlier times the affairs of the community were in charge of the *Amarkol* or *Catholicus*. See Schürer, II, 271.

³⁸ Cf. for the plagues the rabbinical law concerning the *hakam* (Sifra Tazri'a 1; Bekoroth iv, 3-5).

holy and containing an altar for the regular sacrifices.³⁹ In this sacrosanct place sexual intercourse was prohibited.⁴⁰ Each camp or town, however, had a house of worship of its own into which none but the Levitically pure were permitted to enter (p. 11; cf. *Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*, ed. Kayser, Leipzig, 1886, 11, 80).⁴¹

Now it is to be noticed that the institution of a duumvirate ruling over the community is found only during the first and the second pre-Christian century in Judea and was, as is shown in Geiger's *Urschrift*, (115-19), originally Sadducean and only afterward transformed, or adopted, by the Pharisees in the well-known Pairs (*Zuggoth*).

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JURISDICTION

Likewise the civil and criminal laws point almost with certainty to the Jewish and Samaritan conditions and practices of the pre-Christian century. Owing to the lamentably defective state in which the Document is found (14-15), we can make out only the following part of the statute: "No one shall take an oath either by the four-lettered Name, or by any other name such as Elohim or Adonai. Instead, the oath at the court, or when new members are to be admitted into the community, should be administered by the inspector as "an oath of the covenant which Moses established with Israel" and sworn to "by the curses of the covenant" (Deut., chaps. 29, 30; cf. Sanhed. 39a), and the violation of such an oath was avenged by death. Similarly the Essenes, who otherwise refrained from swearing, administered "oaths of an awful character upon any new member to be admitted into their community," and like the Samaritans and Dositheans⁴² they well-nigh apotheosized Moses.⁴³ The passage in Jer., Sanh. 10:28b, quoted by Schechter referring to the Samaritans does not say that they were in the habit of taking an oath by the Tetragram; on the contrary, as is amply evidenced by Geiger,⁴⁴ R. Mana points to them as avoiding the Tetragram and using

³⁹ Cf. Mekilta Yithro, at the close.

⁴⁰ P. 12. Cf. Exod. 19:15; Deut. 23:15; I Sam. 21:5-6.

⁴¹ The term *beth ha Hishtahavoth*, "the house of prostration," whence the Syriac *Be Masgedo*, the Arabic Masged, formed after Zech. 14:16-17, is decidedly Jewish; see Midrash to I Sam. 1:3. So is the term *serek*, "order," which, as Professor Margolis of the Dropsie College has pointed out to the writer, is found twice in the Hebrew Testament of Levi, *J.Q.R.*, XIX, 574, where the Greek has *τάξις*.

⁴² See Schechter, *liv*, n. 15.

⁴³ Josephus, *B.J.*, II, viii, 7-10.

⁴⁴ Nachgel, *Schr.*, III, 261; *Urschrift*, 266.

ha Shem or *Shema* ("the Name") instead.⁴⁵ The Pharisaic courts insisted, however, on an oath by God's name.⁴⁶

It is exactly in the time of Simeon ben Shetaḥ that we are placed by the law "on the recovery of lost goods" [read *al hashabath Abedah*, 9, l. 8]: "He hath said 'Thine own hand shall not help thee.'"⁴⁷ "Therefore he who administers an oath [of proclamation] in the open field and not in the presence of the judges or their by-standers [read *M'aamadam*] his hand has helped him"—that is, he cannot by right keep the goods he found. This obviously refers to the institution recorded in Jer. *Ta'an.*, III, 66*d*, and Babli, *B.M.*, 28*b*, in connection with an utterance of Simeon ben Shetaḥ concerning the "Stone of the Litigant," *Eben ha To'en*,⁴⁸ a stone in the midst of the city of Jerusalem upon which lost goods were deposited by the finder to be handed over to the owner after due proof of his claim, or after an oath had been taken by him. The statute continues: "If anyone has lost a thing, and it is not known who stole it from the storehouse [read *M'ed*] of the camp, the owner shall administer an oath of proclamation by way of a curse, and whosoever hears the same and, knowing the matter, will not tell, he shall be guilty [Lev. 5:1-6]. And if the lost goods have no claimants, all goes to the priests who keep it until the owner is found" (p. 9).

Another interesting point is that "a man who has been seen by a single witness and then by another one committing a certain sacrilegious act, he is by the decision of the inspector expelled from what is called the 'sphere of purity.'" In similar manner the *Episcopos* in the Didascalia II, 16, is told to "cast out the offender with severity, just as Miriam was shut out of the camp seven days for her offense, God having said to Moses: "If her father had but spit her in her face, should she not be ashamed?" This is what the rabbis termed a divine "rebuke" (*Nezi-phah*) with reference to this very passage in Num. 12:14.⁴⁹ The camp in which God's majesty dwelt was not to tolerate in its midst any of those unclean by sin.⁵⁰ But like the *Episcopos* of the Didascalia, the inspector can readmit the offender after he has shown sincere repentance.

⁴⁵ Cf. Lev. 24:11, 16; *Urschr.*, 273 f.

⁴⁶ Sheb. 38*b* f.

⁴⁷ Schechter refers to I Sam. 25:26, 31, 33; but it is probably a quotation from some lost apocryphal work; cf. Tosefta, *B.K.*, X, 38; but altogether foreign to rabbinical law, *B.K.*, 27*b*.

⁴⁸ See Kohut *Aruk s.v.*; scarcely *Eben ha To'im*, "Stone of the Erring."

⁴⁹ Cf. *Sifre* and *M.K.* 16*ab*.

⁵⁰ Num. 5:2-3; *Sifre*; Deut. 23:15; Kel., I, 7; Tos. Kel., I, 13. Targ. J. to Exod. 18:8 and cf. Josephus, *J.W.*, I, viii, 8, regarding the Essene practice.

"No one," says another statute, however (p. 9), "shall hand over as excommunicated a man from his brethren [read *mēzḥav*], to have him put to death after the statutes of the Gentiles, for concerning him it is said [Lev. 19:18]: 'Thou shalt not avenge, nor hold over any wrath against the children of thy people'"—which verse is taken in the sense of a prohibition against handing over for punishment any Israelitish man to non-Israelites. This prohibition against recognition of the jurisdiction of Gentile courts (*ṣarkaoth shel goyim* or *Agoraoth shel nokrim*; note the Greek terms *ἀρχαι* and *ἀγοραι*) is derived by the rabbis from Exod. 21:1,⁵¹ and likewise is found in Didascalia, II, 45, whence also I Cor. 6:1 ff. The warning not to resort to self-revenge, but to leave the vengeance to God—which is based in the Epistle to the Romans upon Deut. 32:35, a passage read differently by the Samaritans—is founded in our Document on Nahum 1:2; and Lev. 19:17 is pointed to as forbidding to give vent to fierce wrath instead of offering kind rebuke. Throughout the Document the lesson of brotherly love, of fostering peace by open rebuke, and of helpful support to the needy is voiced with reference to Lev., chap. 19, a chapter which formed the basis of Jewish ethics and of the Jewish propaganda literature.⁵²

THE LEVITICAL LAWS OF PURITY AND SANCTITY

On the other hand, there is the spirit of inexorable austerity displayed in all the laws concerning Levitical purity and sanctity as well as of the Sabbath that are so characteristic of Sadduceism and Samaritanism. Ewald, already,⁵³ when speaking of the Dositheans, called attention to the name *La Mīsas* ("Touch me not!") given to the Samaritans, which gave rise to the legend of Samiri who as the maker of the Golden Calf was cursed, another Wandering Jew.⁵⁴ The Samaritans were not less, but a great deal more, scrupulous than the Pharisees in regard to these and other Mosaic laws, as was admitted by the early rabbis.⁵⁵ Consequently the statutes concerning the purificatory bath, "the waters of which should not be drawn from a vessel and must be sufficient to envelop man's whole body,"⁵⁶ or that "they should not come

⁵¹ Mekilta and Gittin 88b; also from Ps. 148:19, Tanh. Shofetim.

⁵² See Bernays, *Ges.*, Abh. 1, 192 f., and cf. the thirty Noahic Commandments (Hul. 92a) and *Jew. G. R.*, VI, 259.

⁵³ *G.V.I.*, VII, 139.

⁵⁴ Koran Sura, XX, 97; cf. Albiruni, tr. Sachau, 25, 374; Targ. Yer. to Exod. 32:5.

⁵⁵ Tos., Pesah i, 15; Hul. 4a.

⁵⁶ *Marṣil* from *raṣal*, "to envelop," p. 10, l. 11, is correct and a better term than *Matbil* suggested by Schechter. For *shemo* (p. 12, l. 16), read *bṣaro*.

in direct or indirect contact with impure things (10); as well as the law declaring that vessels may serve as conductors of uncleanness in the house where a dead body lies (12); or that the projecting part of a tomb makes him who stands beneath it unclean—this seems to be the meaning of the obscure sentence in Abul-Fatḥ concerning the “shadow of a grave”—are all derived from temple practice and of Sadducean origin.⁵⁷

Also in regard to woman in her menstruation or after her confinement, the Dositheans, like the rest of the Samaritans, represent the rigorous Sadducean view;⁵⁸ and so they accuse the Pharisees who considered the principles of human dignity and of domestic happiness to be of greater importance than Levitical purity which concerns only the priesthood,⁵⁹ of “polluting the sanctuary.” (p. 5, l. 7). In this connection it is interesting to notice that the Book of Jubilees⁶⁰ lays great stress on this very law in Lev. 12:1, of woman’s purification in connection with Eve’s entrance into Eden’s sanctuary, thus echoing the ancient Sadducean, not merely Samaritan, view. Of course, the later Mishnah authorities judge, or misjudge, the Samaritans from their partisan point of view concerning whom all sorts of slanderous reports were then circulated,⁶¹ which the believer in the Talmudic Halakah is of course bound to accept as true.

LAWS CONCERNING HEATHEN

Quite significant is the attitude taken by the Dosithean law toward the heathen. The Pharisean teachers, in their endeavor to broaden the Torah into a great universal truth, wanted to have the temple at Jerusalem, in the spirit of the prophets and the Psalms, rendered a center of worship provided for, and accessible also to the nations of the world, as may be learned from Suk. 55b.⁶² Accordingly they teach against the letter of the Law (Lev. 22:18–25) that vow-offerings brought by a heathen or a wicked Israelite may be sacrificed upon the altar in order to win the one *over*, and the other *back*, to God,⁶³ only those of apos-

⁵⁷ See Erub. 14ab; Tos. Negaim vi, 2; Sifre to Num. 19:14; Yadayim iv, 7; cf. Tos. Yoma i, 12; iv, 20.

⁵⁸ Nid. iv, 1–2; cf. Munagga in Wreschner’s *Sam. Traditionen*, 30 ff.; Geiger, *He Haluz*, v, 29; vi, 28; *W. Ztschr.*, I, 51; II, 27; Nachgel., *Schr.*, III, 315 f.; Schorr, *He Haluz*, VIII, 51.

⁵⁹ See *Sifra Mezor’a* at the close; Shab. 64b.

⁶⁰ III, 9–14; see Charles’ notes and Beer, *op. cit.*, 40.

⁶¹ See Hul. 6a; Nid. 33a; Kirchheim, *K. Schomron*, 21 ff., and Mas. Kuthim.

⁶² Cf. Philo, ed. Mangey, I, 239, 240, and elsewhere.

⁶³ Sifra Emor, VII, 98a; cf. 99a; Tem. 2; cf. 7a; Men. 73b; Hul. 13b; cf. 5a.

tates would they exclude with reference to Prov. 15:9: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination."⁶⁴ Our Document (p. 11, l. 18) points to the same verse while declaring: "No man shall send to the altar burnt-offering, or meat-offering, or frankincense, or wood, through the hand of any man made unclean by any of the uncleannesses to allow him to make the altar unclean." The same verse is quoted in the Talmud⁶⁵ with the view to prohibit prayer in an unclean spot, or with an unclean body, or after a nocturnal pollution, which last prohibition formed the chief motive for the custom of the Hemero-baptists and Essenes. Accordingly also our Document continues: "And whosoever enters a house of worship shall not enter it when he is unclean without⁶⁶ washing."

Of historical interest are the following statutes (p. 12, ll. 2 ff.): "Any man over whom the spirits of Belial⁶⁷ have dominion, and he speaks rebelliously, he shall be dealt with by the court like an *Ob* and *Yiddeoni*."⁶⁸ (Is this the same as "speaking in tongues," I Cor., chaps. 12-14?) "If, however, he wants to seduce others to profane the Sabbath and the Feasts [espousing the Pharisaic doctrines?] he shall not be forthwith put to death, but watched whether he may be cured. After seven years he may re-enter the Congregation." This implies that he remains thus long excommunicated.

"No man shall stretch forth his arm to shed the blood of any one of the Gentiles for the sake of wealth or gain, nor shall he carry off anything in their possession so as not to lead to blasphemy" [this is the same as the rabbinical *Ḥillul ha Shem*],⁶⁹ "unless it be done by the counsel of the confederation of Israel"—that is, in a state of warfare.

"No one shall sell clean cattle or fowl to Gentiles, lest they may sacrifice them" (to their idols; cf. Abod. Zar. i, 5). "Nor shall he sell anything from his threshing-floor or his wine-press at any of their feasts [read *bēkol Mo'edehehem*, and cf. Ab. Zar. i, 1]. Nor shall he sell them his male slave or female slave who have entered the covenant of Abraham with him."⁷⁰

⁶⁴ Sifra Wayikra II, 4c; cf. *M.K.* 15b.

⁶⁵ Berak. 20b; 22b.

⁶⁶ The word *wēlō* of the line below belongs here.

⁶⁷ A term for Satan found only in the pre-Talmudic literature, corresponding with the rabbinical *Ruah ha Tumah*, "spirit of impurity," as all idolatry is contaminating; see Sanh. 65b; Shab. ix, 1; Tos. Zabim v, 6.

⁶⁸ Deut. 18:10; Sanh. *loc. cit.*

⁶⁹ See art. "Kiddush ha Shem" in the *J.E.*

⁷⁰ Cf. Lev. 25:46; Sifre to Deut. 23:16; Gittin, iv, 6.

THE LAWS CONCERNING THE SABBATH

Most instructive for the study of the entire process of development of the Mosaic law is the chapter devoted in our document to the Sabbath, of the desecration of which the Pharisees are again and again accused. Geiger, whose well-known researches have cast new light upon the historical process of Judaism by showing the close relationship of Samaritanism and Karaism to Sadduceeism, calls special attention to a remarkable passage in the Mishnah, Hag. 1:8,⁷¹ which reads as follows: "The rules concerning the annulment of vows float in the air and have nothing to support them; the rules concerning the Sabbath, the pilgrimage sacrifice [*Hagigah*] and sin-offerings for breach of faith are like mountains suspended by a hair, having but few scriptural, and all the more numerous Halakic expositions!" The former part of these rather perplexing strictures will be discussed later on. The remark about the Pharisaic Sabbath laws, however, concerns us here, as it is a rather naïve criticism of the artificial system of the Pharisaic Sabbath legislation, which has a list of thirty-nine chief kinds of work prohibited on that day. These are based upon the analogy of specific works required for the tabernacle,⁷² without even taking due cognizance of express Scriptural prohibitions such as buying and selling.⁷³ Neither trading nor riding on horseback is regarded as work forbidden by the Law; both are merely forbidden by the rabbis for the reason that they may eventually lead to a direct transgression of the Law, the one to do some writing, the other to cut a branch off the tree for the sake of obtaining a whip.⁷⁴ There is ample evidence, however, that during the Maccabean time a far more rigorous view of the Sabbath prevailed, as is learned not only from the books of the Maccabees, but also from a record preserved in the Talmud,⁷⁵ showing that riding on horseback was punished by the court with stoning to death. In fact, the older Halakah represented by the rigorous Shammaites⁷⁶ insisted on the same principle adhered to by the Samaritans, that no work should be begun on Sabbath eve which is not entirely finished at the entrance of the Sabbath, whereas the liberal school of Hillel made ever new concessions for the sake of "rendering the Sabbath

⁷¹ See his *Lesestücke aus der Mishnah*, 91.

⁷² Mek. to. Exod. 35:1; Shab. 70a.

⁷³ Jer. 18:21 f.; Neh. 10:32; 14:15; cf. Amos 8:5.

⁷⁴ See Maim., *H. Shab.*, xxiii, 12; xxi, 9.

⁷⁵ Yeb. 90b; Sanh. 46a.

⁷⁶ Shab. i, 5-8; cf. Tos. Shab. i, 21; and see Geiger, *Nachgel. Schr.*, III, 288; *He Haluz* vi, 15-19.

a delight,"⁷⁷ laying down the principle that "the Sabbath is given over to you, not you to the Sabbath."⁷⁸

Against these Pharisaic innovations, which created the fiction of the *Erub*^{79a}, the duty of kindling the Sabbath light⁷⁹ and similar things (*B.K.* 82a) and permitting work to be done by Gentiles in cases of need, there came the protestations of the exponents of the old Sadducean law as voiced in the Book of Jubilees, according to which it is forbidden under the penalty of death "to prepare anything to be eaten or drunk that had not been prepared the day before, to draw water, to bring in, or take out any burden through the gate, or to have any intercourse with one's wife,⁸⁰ to set out on a journey, to transact any business; also to ride on a beast, or to travel by ship on the sea, to strike or kill anything, to catch an animal, or to fast, or to make war on the Sabbath."⁸¹ These same prohibitions are stated in "the Sabbath Commandments of the Falashas,"⁸² and there is added thereto "to have a quarrel with, or to pronounce a curse against, anyone on Sabbath, or to rise from the seat and turn aside to ease nature."⁸³ It is accordingly the old Sadducean standpoint from which the Sabbath laws in our Document are written (pp. 10-11). We give them here in full, while at the same time endeavoring to elucidate some of the obscure points:

"No one shall do any work on the sixth day from the time when the sun's disk is still at a distance from the gate of its entering [read *Mebool*]; for He hath said: 'Guard the Sabbath day'" [Deut. 5:12]. This interpretation of the term *shamor*, "guard," in the sense of making a fence around the law in order to prevent its transgression is not only accepted by the Karaites, but based upon ancient tradition (see *M.K.* 5a; *Yebam.* 21a; *W. B. Levy, s.v. "Mishmereth"*). In fact, it was a long-established priestly practice to have signals given by trumpets from the temple hilltops at the beginning of twilight to stop the people from work (Josephus, *J.B.*, IV, ix, 12; *Sukk.* V, 5). Accordingly a misplaced paragraph in our Document at the close of p. 11 (found "obscure" by the editor) reads: "When the trumpets of the Congregation are sounded, whether earlier or later, the people shall cease from work, for it is Sabbath altogether holy."

⁷⁷ Isa. 58:13; *Shab.* 118ab.

⁷⁸ *Mek. Ki Tissa*; *Yoma* 85b; cf. Mark 2:27: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

^{79a} See Schürer, II, 414, 491 f.

⁸⁰ Cf. *He Halutz*, vi, 30 ff.

⁷⁹ Schürer, III, 166.

⁸¹ *Jub.* 2:29 f.; 1:8-13.

⁸² *Teezaza Sanbat*, tr. by Halévy, Paris, 1902.

⁸³ Halévy, 142, seemingly misunderstood the words; but cf. "Essenes," *J.E.*, V, 229, col. ii.

Our Document continues: "No one shall speak vile and idle speech on the Sabbath day." This is based upon Isa. 58:13 (cf. Shab. 150a). This statute is also found in the Falasha Commandments quoted above and has its striking parallel in the Essene Sabbath prayer preserved in the Apostolic Constitutions (cf. art. "Didascalia," *J.E.*, IV, 594, col. i) in which occurs the sentence: "No one should utter forth one word in anger on the Sabbath day, for the Sabbath is given for the study of the Law" (cf. *Pesik. Rab.*, XXIII, p. 121).

"No one shall demand any debt of his neighbor, nor shall he bring a suit in court for any property or gain. Neither shall he discuss matters of business, or work to be done for the following morning. Nor shall anyone walk into the field to watch [?] the work of his affairs on the Sabbath, nor go out of his city beyond the limit of [two] thousand cubits." This Halakah based on Num. 35:5 (Erub. 50b) is very old (see Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII, viii, 4; Acts 1:12; cf. Schürer, I, 246; II, 475).

"One shall not eat or drink anything on the Sabbath unless it has been prepared and brought into the camp before." This is based on Exod. 16:5. "If one is on the road and goes into the water to bathe, he may drink while standing, but he shall not draw into the vessel." This is based on Exod. 16:26.

"No man shall send the son of a stranger to do his affairs on the Sabbath day." Compare the rabbinical view according to which this is not forbidden by the Law (Maim., *H. Sch.*, VI, 1).

"A man shall not put upon himself filthy garments, or such as are brought in . . . unless they are washed in water, or daubed with frankincense." The meaning seems to be that working-day garments which are either dirty or have an offensive odor should not be worn on the Sabbath (cf. Shab. 113a). Schechter's reading *bēgoy*, by a Gentile, and his interpretation of the statute hardly seems acceptable, as the Levitical impurity ascribed to the stranger (*Introd.*, xv) cannot be removed by rubbing the garment which he brought or touched, with drugs.

"No man shall fast of his own free will on the Sabbath." Cf. besides Jubilees and *Falasha Comm.* quoted above, Judith 8:6, and Maim., *H. Sh.*, XXX, 12. Read *Yithra'ab*.

"No man shall walk behind the cattle to make it browse outside of the city beyond the two-thousand cubits." The idea is that like himself his cattle should not pass the Sabbath limit.

"He shall not lift his hand to beat it with his fist, nor remove it with force if it be stubborn."

"No man shall carry anything out of the house or into the house, and standing at the entrance, he shall neither take anything out, nor bring anything in."

"No man shall carry about him drugs when going out or in, on the Sabbath." This is also prohibited in the Mishnah, Shab. vi, 5.

"He shall not open a glued vessel on Sabbath." According to the rabbis this does not fall under the category of work, whereas the Karaites also forbid it (see Schechter, notes). "No one shall move about rock or earth in the

house on Sabbath." "The nurse shall not carry the suckling child while going out or coming in on Sabbath." So also Mishnah, Shab. xviii, 2.

"No man shall deliver a beast giving birth to her young on the Sabbath day." So also Mishnah xviii, 3. "And if one falls into a pit or a ditch, he shall not raise it on Sabbath." Here the rabbinic law, in view of the animal's suffering, is much milder. (See Shab. xviii, 2; Talmud Shab. 128*b*; Maim., *H. Sh.*, XXV, 26, and cf. Matt. 12:11.) "And if any person falls into a gathering of water, or into a ravine [read *ma'amak*], one shall not bring him up on a ladder and with a rope or any other instrument." Here the Pharisaic law differs, declaring the *saving of life* to be the paramount duty (Yoma 84*b*; Tos. Shab. xv, 16-17; Mekilta Ki Tissa 110).

"No man shall scold his man-servant or maid-servant, or his hireling on the Sabbath day." So also the Falasha law and Didascalia, II, 47; V, 10, and the Sabbath prayer quoted above.

"No one shall take his Sabbath rest in a place near the Gentiles, staying there over Sabbath." This law is derived, according to Munagga, the Samaritan writer, from Lev. 23:3: "It is a Sabbath unto the Lord in all your dwellings," which is taken to signify that the Israelites should not dwell in a place where one lives who violates the Sabbath (see Wreschner, *op. cit.*, 13). This law was adopted also by *Anan* (see Harkavy, *Likute Kadmonioth*, 6-7). Wreschner's point of view is a misconception of the facts. "No one shall violate the Sabbath on account of wealth and gain." This refers to the preceding paragraph, urging the man of business not to spend his Sabbath among the Gentiles in order to obtain material advantages. "No one shall bring upon the altar [any free will offerings] save the regular burnt-offering of the Sabbath, for it says: Besides the Sabbaths of the Lord [and besides your gifts and all of your vows and all your free will offerings] (Lev. 23:38). That is to say: the latter are not to be offered on the Sabbath of the Lord.

THE LAWS CONCERNING VOWS

Just as our Document protests against the Pharisaic innovations concerning the Sabbath observance, so it deprecates the laxity with which the Pharisean teachers would annul vows, thereby infringing upon things pertaining to the sanctuary. No doubt, these vows, made rashly in moments of distress and anxiety, which in the early biblical times brought doom on the people, as seen in the story of Jephtha's daughter, and which are deprecated by the author of Koheleth v, 1-5, became matters of serious consideration to the sages who saw the welfare of the people frequently undermined by them.⁸⁴ In view of this the Pharisees boldly declared by way of analogy that, just as the Law in Num. 30:1 f. empowers father and husband to annul the woman's

⁸⁴ Cf. Shab. 32*b*; Nedar. 20*a*.

vow, so shall "the heads of the tribes," or the sages, by the power and authority of their wisdom and knowledge, be empowered to annul the vow made by persons with due consideration of the circumstances involved.⁸⁵ This power of "binding and loosing"⁸⁶ was naturally enough contested by the Sadducees, and so our Document reads (p. 16): "And since the Law says: That which has gone out of thy mouth thou shalt keep [Deut. 23:25] to fulfil it, any binding oath which a man puts upon himself to perform a commandment of the Law, he cannot make it void not even at the price of death; and if a man takes a vow upon himself to depart from the Law, even at the price of death he shall not fulfil it. And as regards the oath of a woman of which Moses says that her oath may be annulled [Num. 30:3-9], let no one annul an oath of which he [the husband] does not know whether [read *im* instead of *dm*] it should be confirmed or annulled: If it be for transgressing the covenant, he shall annul it, and not confirm it. And so is the law also for the father."⁸⁷

THE DIETARY LAWS

The chapter on the Dietary Laws has only two paragraphs in our Document (p. 12); the rest seems to have been omitted by the copyist partly through carelessness, partly for other reasons. They read as follows: "None shall contaminate himself by any [forbidden] wild beast and creeping thing by eating therefrom—from beehives to the soul of any living thing that moves in the water. Fish shall not be eaten unless they were split alive and their blood shed; and all the locusts after their kinds shall be put into fire or water while alive, for this is the manner of their creation." As to their forbidding honey, Schechter (*Introd.*, xxiv) thinks that they regarded it as a part taken from a living animal which falls under the category of the law: "Thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh" (Deut. 12:23), which is binding upon the half-proselyte or Noahide as well (Hul. 101b f.); for which reason they forbade, according to Abul-Fath, also the eating of eggs except those found in a slaughtered animal. In n. 20, p. li, Schechter ascribed the reason for the prohibition to a possible mixture of the honey with particles of the bee, considered also by the Karaites in their observation of the law.

⁸⁵ Jer. Hag. i, 76c; cf. Bereshit R. 60, 4.

⁸⁶ Josephus, *B.J.*, i, 52; cf. art. in *J.E.*

⁸⁷ The rest of the defective text I would translate as follows: "As regards vow-offerings no one shall vow unto the altar a thing obtained by force. Nor shall the priests take anything from Israel by mere force. Neither shall a man devote the food which belongs to a Gentile [read *legoy*] for this is what He said: They capture each other by a ban" [*herem* is taken in the sense of ban in Micah 7:2].

That the Samaritans were stricter in their dietary laws than the Pharisees is expressly stated in the ancient Baraitha.⁸⁸ As to the prohibition against eating fish and locusts, unless they were killed in the manner prescribed, Munagga, the Samaritan writer,⁸⁹ confirms this law as being Samaritan, while pointing to the fact that Scripture calls both fish and locusts which have died of themselves "carcasses" (*Nebelah*) which contaminate the eater. Wreschner's attempt to represent the Samaritans as imitators of Harranian, or Hindoo, practices is dictated by his Halakic view, and is not justified by the facts. It is also to be noticed that Jub. 6:12 does not include the blood of fish and locusts among the prohibitions mentioned there—a fact which disproves Schechter's theory concerning the relation of the Dositheans to this "heretical" book.

THE LAWS ON FORBIDDEN MARRIAGES

The laws concerning forbidden marriages are no longer preserved in our Document. The importance assigned to them, however, by the authors of the Manifesto is shown in the introductory part (4-5) in which the charge of "fornication" is brought against the Pharisees in view of the following facts:⁹⁰

"They marry two wives while both of them are alive, whereas the fundamental law of creation is expressed in the Scripture: 'God created man male and female' [Gen. 1:27], and, going into the ark, 'they went in two and two, male and female' [7:9]; also regarding the prince it is written: 'He shall not have many wives' [Deut. 17:20]—a law which David did not read in the Book of the Law, it having remained hidden away in the ark, as it remained unopened in Israel from the day of the death of Eleazer and Joshua and the elders all the while the people worshiped the Astarte idols until a Zadok[ite] [II Kings 20:22] rose and revealed what was hidden and then became known [read *wayegalleh hatamun we niggalu*] the deeds of David aside from the murder of Uriah, and God left them to him." (The line following, concerning the Pharisæic treatment of the wife in her menstruation was spoken of above.) "And they marry the daughter of their brother or sister, whereas the law of Moses which forbids the man to marry the sister of his mother, declaring her to be the mother's near kin, applies also to woman and con-

⁸⁸ *Mas. Kuthim*, ed. Kirchheim, 33-34.

⁸⁹ Wreschner, *op. cit.*, 51.

⁹⁰ The text (p. 4, l. 19) reads: "The builders of the hollow partition wall (Separatists) who walk after empty talk." *Zav* in Hos. 5:11 means emitting sounds; cf. Mic. 12:6, 11; see also Cheney in Haupt's *Bible*, p. 153, on *Zav le Zav*.

sequently forbids also the brother's daughter to marry her father's brother, he being her father's kin."

Now as to the prohibition of marrying two wives while they are both alive—of which, by the way, the Book of Jubilees makes no mention—it is to this very day observed by the Samaritans except in the case of the childlessness of the first wife when the husband has to divorce her.⁹¹ The rabbis also found polygamy to be contrary to the law of humanity.⁹² Nor is it merely the Karaites who adopted the prohibition of polygamy,⁹³ but the early church also prohibited bigamy to the bishop and the deacon⁹⁴ "because it is said (Gen. 2:24), 'and he shall cleave to his wife,' and not 'wives.'"

How far back the prohibition against marrying the niece goes, which Anan and the early Karaites adopted, while using the same argument as stated in our Document⁹⁴ cannot be stated for the present. Estor ha Parhi's view indorsed by Zunz⁹⁵ and Steinschneider⁹⁶ that the Karaites adopted it from the Samaritans and the latter from the Koran (Surah iv, 27) must now be discarded as false. Not only was the prohibition known to be in force among certain sectaries (*Minim*) in the Geonic time⁹⁷ but also the early Christian church had in the Apostolic Canons (Par. xix) the following statute: "He who has married two sisters (one after the other) or his brother's or sister's daughter cannot be a clergyman."⁹⁸ On the other hand, it is the Book of Jubilees which sets up the rule that each pious man should marry the daughter of his brother or sister;⁹⁹ exactly as does the Talmud,¹⁰⁰ another proof of the fallacy of Beer's and Schechter's theory concerning the relationship of the Book of Jubilees to the Dosithean sect.

⁹¹ Peterman, *Reisen im Orient*, I, 279.

⁹² See Aboth d. R., Nathan ed., Schechter 5a; Sifre and Tanh. to Deut. 21:5; Pesik. R. xliii; Beresh. R. xxiii, 3.

⁹³ Lekah Tob to Deut. 21:5, to which Schechter refers.

⁹⁴ Didascalia ii, 2, 2; I Tim. 3:12; and *Canones Jacobs von Edessa*, ed. Kayser, 160-62.

⁹⁵ See Harkavy's *Lik. Kadm.*, 97, 100; Hadassi, 117c, and Graetz, *Gesch.*, V³, 449.

⁹⁶ *Gesammelte Schriften*, II, 303.

⁹⁶ *Polem. Lit.*, 398.

⁹⁷ See Poznanski in the *Kaufmann Gedenkbuch*, 173.

⁹⁸ Didascalia, ed. Funk, 568. So also the Syrian church. See Kayser's *Canones Jacobs von Edessa*, loc. cit.

⁹⁹ See 4:15-33; 8:5, 6; 9:7.

¹⁰⁰ Yebam 62b; Sanh. 76b; Beresh. R. xviii, 5; cf. *Jewish Q.R.*, V, 406, note.

THE CALENDAR SYSTEM AND THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

We now come to the one point which seems to support this theory, all the more so as our Document directly refers to the Book of Jubilees under the name of "the Book of the Divisions of the Seasons according to Their Jubilees and Their [Year] Weeks" (p. 16);¹⁰¹ while at the same time the Document teems with verbal quotations from Jubilees, as Schechter's notes sufficiently show. It is the calendar system of the Pharisees which the Manifesto in its introductory part (p. 3, l. 14; p. 6, l. 18) condemns, while declaring "its own Sabbaths and festivals to be the revelation of hidden things concerning which all Israel have gone astray." Exactly so, the Book of Jubilees (1:29; 6:22-37; 1:5) has its own system of reckoning the years, the festivals, and the Sabbath dictated from the heavenly tablets by the angel of God's presence to Moses and to Noah with the contention that "the order of the years and feasts of the people is one of error and of ignorance." Now, our Document in its present defective state offers no information about the calendar system which it declares to be divinely revealed. All the more light is furnished on the subject by what the Samaritan, the Karaite, and the Jewish sources tell us of the sect called Dosithean by the one and Zadokite by the other. All these agree that the calendar was a solar, instead of a lunar, one, and the months were fixed at thirty days each. This system is presented at length in the Book of Jubilees in connection with the covenant of God made with Noah after the flood where, with reference to Gen. 7:11 and 8:3, 4, 14, 22, the reckoning is made after the solar year and months of thirty days. It assigns 364 days to the year, that is, twelve months each of thirty days, with four intercalary days at the end of the four seasons, and altogether 52 weeks, so as to have each year begin on the first day of the week and all the festivals of each year fall on the same day; hence also the Feast of the Weeks in accord with the letter of the Law (Lev. 23:15-16), "on the morrow of the Sabbath." Only thus, says the Book of Jubilees, "will the seasons not be disturbed and the feasts of the year not be

¹⁰¹ The passage strangely interrupts the context and seems to be a marginal note suggested by the term *Malak Mastema*, for Satan, found exclusively in the Book of Jubilees for Satan. Speaking of the readmission of the penitent (proselyte?) "who returns to the Law of Moses," the Document continues: "And on the day on which the man sincerely returns to the Law of Moses, 'the angel of hostility' will turn away from him, if he shall but fulfil his promise. For this reason was Abraham circumcised on the day he learned of it"—that is of the Law of the Covenant (Jubil. 15:26-34). Here the marginal note reads: "For this is stated clearly . . . in the Book of the Divisions of the Seasons according to Their Jubilees and Their Weeks."

dislodged."¹⁰² In order fully to appreciate the spirit which prompted this seemingly arbitrary system, cognizance must be taken of the fact that the Mosaic law in the case of the Jubilee year actually counts the new year from the day following the Atonement Day, that is the 11th of the 7th month, and not from the first day. It thus reckons the year after the solar calendar as was done by Ezek. 40:1.¹⁰³ On the other hand, Sadducean tradition insisted upon having the Pentecost feast always on Sunday in conformity with Lev. 23:15-16, which, according to modern historico-critical exegesis,¹⁰⁴ has no other meaning than "the day following the weekly Sabbath."¹⁰⁵ It was undoubtedly on account of their opposition to the Pharisean authorities in Jerusalem, who fixed the calendar by observation of the moon and in accordance with their interpretation of the term "the morrow after the Sabbath" as signifying the sixteenth day of Sivan, that the Samaritans and the Boethusians, the successors of the Sadducean party, contrived by false signals to mislead the Jewish people in their reckoning of the months. Now the best way of emancipating themselves from the Pharisaic authorities was the introduction of the solar calendar as presented by the Book of Jubilees. Here the Feast of Weeks (*Ḥag ha Shabuoth*) seems to have been taken in the sense of "the Feast of the Covenant-Oaths," being the day on which God concluded the Covenant with Noah, with the patriarchs, and with the people of Israel,¹⁰⁶ and, instead of the fifth or

¹⁰² See the instructive notes of Charles to Jubilees 6:29-36.

¹⁰³ Cf. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*, 421 f.

¹⁰⁴ See Berthelot, Dillmann-Ryssel, and Driver.

¹⁰⁵ Originally the seven harvest weeks were not all, or only loosely, connected with the Passover, or Maʒzot festival (see Deut. 15:9 and cf. Josh. 5:11). There are also indications in Scripture (see I Sam. 20:5, 18 ff.) that the month consisted originally in the pre-exilic time of four weeks with the seventh day as the Sabbath and two days celebrated as new moon festivals, so that practically each new moon and each full moon began on the first day of the week. A dim remembrance of this fact may underlie the tradition of the Sadducees and Samaritans as well as the calendar system of the Book of Jubilees. (Cf. Hitzig, *Ostern u. Pfingsten*, 4 f., where attention is called to the Pentecost festival mentioned by Josephus [*Ant.*, XIII, viii, 4] as having been celebrated in the time of John Hyrcanus on the day after Sabbath.) However, the Septuagint translates Lev. 23:11, "the morrow of the first day," in accordance with the Pharisean doctrine. So also Josephus (*Ant.*, III, x, 5) and Philo (*De Septennario*, 20); neither of them knows of the Feast of Weeks being celebrated as the Memorial Day of the Giving of the Law (Exod. 19:1 f.) as found in the Synagogue liturgy which must have been known to the author of the Book of Jubilees 1:1; 6:17; 15:1 (see Charles' notes), as well as to the Therapeutae (see art. in *J.E.*, XII, 139) and to the early Christians (see Spitta, *Apstelgesch.*, 27, to Acts 2:1 ff.).

¹⁰⁶ See Charles' note on Jub. 1:1.

sixth of Sivan,¹⁰⁷ the fifteenth of the third month is given as the festival day.

Now, far from being shunned as one of the "heretical" books condemned by R. Akiba, Sanh. x, 1, as Professor Schechter represents it in his *Introduction*, the Book of Jubilees was greatly used by the authors of *Seder Olam* ascribed to R. Jose of the second century,¹⁰⁸ as well as by other Midrash works,¹⁰⁹ and was still in use in Geonic times.¹¹⁰ In all probability it had a determining influence on the Falashas in Abyssinia, as is especially pointed out by Eppstein in his book *Eldad Ha Dani*; but this is by no means the case in regard to the Dosithean sect whose views concerning the marriage and the dietary laws differ from the teachings of the Book of Jubilees, as has been shown above in contradiction to the assumption of Beer and Schechter.

THE ZADOKITES AND KARAITES

After having thus examined our Document in its entirety, we can only arrive at the one conclusion that the messianic pronouncement and the constitution we have before us in fragmentary form emanated from the immediate followers of Dositheus, the Samaritan heresiarch, who claimed to be the Messiah from the Samaritan line of the Zadokite priesthood and was declared to be "the only teacher of righteousness" (*Zedek*), as he wanted to have the law restored in full conformity with the view and tradition of the Zadokite priesthood. While in accord with the Samaritan views in the main, he differs from them particularly in regard to the prophetic books, which he recognizes as more or less inspired, rejecting merely the Judaic hopes founded on the Davidic dynasty, while at the same time he makes ample use of the pseudepigraphic literature that seems then to have been widely read, but was lost sight of thereafter in the rabbinic schools. The whole forms an important link in the development of the pre-Talmudic lore, Halakic or Haggadic. It strongly confirms the theory of Abraham Geiger as to the relationship of Samaritanism and Karaism to Sadduceeism, which, far from being a mere heresy or sectarianism, represents rather the legal and doctrinal system of the Zadokite priesthood in its unbending adherence to temple tradition and ancient practice, in contrast to the progressive and democratic views of the Pharisees. In attempting to define Sadduceeism as "a sort of countertradition or an interpretation

¹⁰⁷ Shab. 86b, where a difference of opinion between R. Jose and others is expressed.

¹⁰⁸ See Ratner, *Mabo le Sed. s, Olam*, 109, and Pirke d. R. Eliezer, chap. 8.

¹⁰⁹ See Jellinek *Beth ha Midrash*, iii.

¹¹⁰ Ratner 110, and *J.Q.R.*, II, 190.

claiming to go back to primitive Judaism" (*Introd.*, xxi, n. 35), Professor Schechter seemingly has altogether forgotten that in his *Ben Sira Introd.*, 35, he called attention to the prominence given to the priestly house of Zadok of which Simon the Just was so fine a type, and that he thereby offered the best possible corroboration of Geiger's view of the Sadducees, indorsed by Wellhausen, Schürer, and others.¹¹¹ The story in *Aboth d. R. Nathan*, v,¹¹² of Zadok and Boethus does not represent these two disciples of Antigonus of Soko themselves as founders of the Sadducean and Boethusian sects, but states that their disciples' disciples founded these sects. Only the patristic and rabbinical literature speaks of them as heresiarchs. In the tenth century we are boldly told by Saadia¹¹³ that, in opposition to Zadok and Boethus who wanted to change the Jewish calendar system, Antigonus of Soko and his court of justice instituted the regulation of the festivals by observation of the moon. This is denied by Hasan b. Mashiah, the Karaite, who says the writings of Zadok "which are generally known" contain nothing on that point. Kirkisani, however, the Karaite who lived also in the middle of the tenth century, dwells at great length on the works of Zadok, which must then have been widely circulated, and Professor Schechter's scholarly introduction has made it reasonably clear that it was our Document, probably in a more complete form, which passed as the work of Zadok.

Professor Schechter has made it highly probable, if not certain, that the Document brought to light by him formed the very source of Anan's system, or of early Karaism, which, as Kirkisani relates, was founded upon the books of Zadok. The very argument with which Anan in his "Book of the Commandments" bases the prohibition of marrying the niece upon the Scripture is to the very letter identical with that given in our Document, and thus the whole system of early Karaism of which the amplification of forbidden marriages forms the most prominent part, rests upon the Dosithean work. We thus possess in this Document the connecting link between the ancient Sadducean and Samaritan lore

¹¹¹ From the Halakic point of view Ben Sira had as little right to be placed among the Ketubim ("the holy writings") in the Baraita quoted Baba Kamma 92b, as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs had in Sifre Num. 12; Sota 7b, where, notwithstanding Schechter's emendation (*Introd.*, xxvii, n. 65), the passage must have well-known written "words of the Haggadah" in view. See Sanh. 100b; Yer. Sanh. x, 28b; Koh. R. xii, 13, and cf. Joel, *Blicke in d. Religionsgesch.*, I, 68-76, where it is shown that the words "external books" refer to works of heretics and not to non-canonical or pseudepigraphical works. The entire apocalyptic literature also of the rabbis consists of pseudepigrapha.

¹¹² Ed. Schechter, 26.

¹¹³ Quoted in Geiger's *Urschrift*, 106, note.

and the doctrines of the Karaites in a far more direct form than Geiger and Harkavy could expect. We now understand better how in pointing to "Zadokite" books the Karaites could call themselves "followers of Zadok" and why they were identified by mediaeval Jewish writers, Saadia, Juda Ha Levi, Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, and others, with the old Zadokites.¹¹⁴

But we must go a step farther. The Dosithean work alone passing under the name of Zadok could not well have exerted that great influence upon the Karaites in their reaction against Talmudism, had not a remnant of the Dosithean sect kept alive the Sadducean tradition and directly assumed the more familiar name of Zadokite. According to Photius, the Dositheans in about 600 C.E. held a dispute with the Alexandrian bishop Eulogius, with the result that they were expelled from Egypt. Scattered over the entire East, then, they may have assumed the name of Zadokites and kindled the messianic hopes which finally led to the creation of the sect that called itself "Mourners for Zion" before it became known as that of the Karaites. The name of Dositheus was forgotten and was preserved only in the quaint legend found in Tanh. Wayesheb and Pirke d. R. Eliezer xxxviii, telling of Rabbi Dosethai and Rabbi Sabuya, the representatives of the two Samaritan sects, as having been the instigators of the Samaritan schism in the time of King Senaherib and then solemnly put under the ban.

DOSITHEAN INFLUENCE UPON JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND SECTS

There is nothing in the teachings of the Falashas or in their history to support Schechter's opinion that they had anything in common with the Dosithean sect. Their system, if not altogether founded upon, is at least identical with, that proposed in the Book of Jubilees which, as has been shown, differs in many essential points from the Dosithean Document and looks to Jerusalem as the holy city. The prayers of the Falashas are, in particular, Essene in character and have both Jerusalem and the house of David as the central objects of their hope for the future.

On the other hand there are a number of points in our Document that suggest a relationship to the early Christian church. The Didascalia has been referred to several times in this article, but this was shown by the writer in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (s.v.) to have been originally an Essene work. Nor must any stress be laid upon the name New Covenant given to the Dosithean system of Mosaism as accepted by the sect in

¹¹⁴ See Harkavy in *Graetz. Gesch.*, V³, 413 ff.

the land of Damascus. It by no means signifies a new dispensation in the sense the term is used in the New Testament with reference to Jer. 31:31.¹¹⁵ Another question is whether the term "New Covenant" did not become known to Judaeo-Christians who, as Julianus Africanus tells us,¹¹⁶ settled in the vicinity of Damascus and thus may have had some influence upon the Paulinian church.

There is certainly a striking resemblance between our Document (p. 19, ll. 7 f.) and the New Testament passage, Matt. 26:31 and parallels, in regard to the use of the prophetic utterance in Zech. 12:7. In describing the messianic end of the visitation our Document quotes: "O sword, awake against my shepherd and against the man that is my fellow, says God, smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered," and then continues with reference to Zech. 11:7 and Ezek. 9:4 to describe the day of judgment when "the ones will be marked for life and escape, and the others delivered to the avenging sword." This same passage is quoted by Jesus during the great night of trial at the Mount of Olives in a rather puzzling manner, and the explanation offered¹¹⁷ is that the dispersion of the followers of Jesus and their flight to the North of Judea is here alluded to. We are here referred directly to the story of Africanus and Hegesippus concerning the men who fled to Galilee and Damascus.¹¹⁸ But there are other indications that the Judaeo-Christian sects had come under the influence of the Dositheans. Ebion, the mythical founder of the Ebionite sect, is said to have lived in Kokaba, "in the Decapolis" where, according to Epiphanius¹¹⁹ the early Christians, called Nazarenes, lived (see Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 428).¹²⁰ How far the story of the star at Bethlehem in Matt. 2:2 was influenced by the star in Num. 24:17 is rather difficult to say, as the story has many parallels pointing to Persian and Babylonian origins.

More directly the messianic title, "the Star" in our Manifesto,

¹¹⁵ Cf. Heb. 8:8-12.

¹¹⁶ See Eusebius, *H.E.*, I, 7, 14.

¹¹⁷ See Weizsacker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, I.

¹¹⁸ Eusebius, *H.E.*, I, 7, 14; III, 20.

¹¹⁹ *Haeres.*, xxix, 7; xxx, 2.

¹²⁰ According to Epiphanius, *Haeres.*, xxx, 2, the Ebionites observed the Levitical purity laws as strictly as did the Samaritans and, as we have seen, the Dositheans. They, however, rejected sacrificial worship (Epiphanius, xxx, 16), which, strange to say, was retained by some oriental churches, the Syrian, Armenian, and Abyssinian, down to modern times (see Kayser, *op. cit.*, 171; Petermann, *op. cit.*, I, 227; Prot. R. E., *Syrische Kirche*, XIX, 302; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, X, 617), and this cannot be due to Jewish influence, as has been asserted.

seems to have influenced that of *Bar Kokba*, the pseudo-Messiah and hero of the Hadrianic war. Opinions differ as to whether his real name was Bar Kokeba ("Son of the town Kokaba"),¹²¹ or Bar Koziba ("Son of Koziba"); all we know is that R. Akiba, the great teacher of Israel, proclaimed him the Messiah, applying to him the messianic verse of Num. 24:17. Hence he was called "the Son of the Star" until his star declined, and, when defeat came, his name was changed into that Bar Koziba ("Son of Falsehood").¹²² It is strange, however, that both terms Kokab and Ish ha Kazab ("Man of Falsehood") occur in our Manifesto.¹²³ More striking still is the fact that according to Syncellus (quoted in the *J.E.* article) Bar Kokba was also called "the only one," *Μονογένης*, which corresponds with the name given to Dositheus in our Manifesto. The history of Bar Kokba is by no means fully cleared up as yet.

Altogether our Document shows points of contact with many movements in Jewish and Judaeo-Christian history, and both historians and theologians will do well to study more closely the important publication of Professor Schechter. It is to be hoped that the missing parts of the fragment or the more complete work will some day be found and cast further light upon a period which may be called one of the most fruitful in the religious history of the world.

¹²¹ There are several villages by that name in northern Palestine; one near Beth Shemesh has the name of Kaukab el Hama ("Star of the Sun"). See Schwarz, *D. heilige Land*, 133; Neubauer, *La géographie du Talmud*, 269; Noeldeke, *Z.D.M.G.*, 1868, 521, who mentions two villages Kaukab in Galilee; cf. *Land Anecdota Syr.*, I, 106, 191; Zahn, *Forschungen*, II, 333 f.

¹²² See article "Bar Kokba" in *J.E.*

¹²³ For the latter name see p. 20, l. 15, where it refers to Simeon ben Shetaḥ.